

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9, 17, 29-30, and 48-57 are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicants have amended certain claims. In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

In particular, dependent claim 2 has been amended to remove an antecedent basis issue. In addition, claims 17 and 48 have been amended to improve readability of the claims and correct typographical errors. Furthermore, independent claims 1, 29, and 30 have been rewritten in an attempt to clarify the invention and to include subject matter previously recited in now-canceled claim 19.

As no new matter has been added by the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons provided on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicants have rewritten claim 2 to replace the term "component" with the term "compound".

In light of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112 rejection is overcome. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,290,614 to Kennedy *et al.* for the reasons provided on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Kennedy does not disclose or suggest the present invention for the reasons that follow.

Kennedy generally discloses a golf ball including a fast-chemical-reaction-produced component that is produced via reaction injection molding. *See, e.g.*, Col. 4, lines 39-41. Kennedy does not disclose or even suggest, however first and second reactable components having viscosities of less than about 20,000 cPs, as presently recited in independent claim 1. This feature of the independent claim was previously recited in dependent claim 19.

With regard to the subject matter previously recited in dependent claim 19, the Examiner cites the paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5 in an effort to provide support for his rejection. This text, however, is describing the difference between reaction injection molding

and non-reaction injection molding. In particular, the text points out that with non-reaction injection molding there is no significant chemical reaction taking place when the thermoplastic resin is introduced into the mold and the "viscosity of the molten resin usually is in the range of 50,000 to about 1,000,000 cP, and is *typically around 200,000 cP*. Col. 5, lines 6-9 and 15-17 (emphasis added). There is nothing in this portion of the disclosure that teaches the viscosity of the reactable components. In fact, this portion of the disclosure relates to a non-reactable resin used for non-reaction injection molding.

For the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Kennedy does not disclose or even suggest the invention recited in independent claim 1 and those claims depending therefrom. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection based thereon.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Combination of Kennedy and Ichikawa Does Not Render Obvious Claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kennedy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,582,325 to Ichikawa *et al.* as provided on page 4 of the Office Action. As discussed above, Kennedy is deficient with regard to the invention recited in independent claim 1 at least because of its lack of disclosure regarding the viscosities of the first and second reactable components. And, as the Examiner appears to rely on Ichikawa only for its disclosure of a reaction product of a polyol and a polyisocyanate, the secondary reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Kennedy with respect to its lack of teaching of the viscosities of the first and second reactable components.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kennedy and Ichikawa does not render obvious the present invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based thereon.

Kennedy Does Not Suggest Claims 30 and 55-57

The Examiner also rejected claims 30 and 55-57 under § 103(a) as being obvious over Kennedy for the reasons set forth on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. Similar to amended independent claim 1 discussed in detail above, independent claim 30 now recites specific ranges of viscosity for the first and second reactable components. Thus, Kennedy does not render obvious the subject matter in independent claim 30.

At best, Kennedy generally discusses the viscosity of resin components in non-reactive injection molding. *See, e.g.*, Col. 5, lines 6-9. This viscosity not only relates to non-

reactive components, which are different from the reactable components featured in the claims, the range disclosed is much higher than presently recited.

In addition, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's broad assumption that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the present invention's recitation of hard and soft segments in the reacted polymer. As Kennedy is completely silent as to any particular ranges of hard and soft segments in the reaction product, Applicants respectfully submit that a skilled artisan would not have been motivated to select the recited ranges without the present invention to use as a template.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kennedy does not render obvious the invention recited in independent claim 30 and dependent claims 55-57. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based thereon.

Claim 54 Is Not Rendered Obvious By Kennedy and Bock

Claim 54 was also rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Kennedy in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,288,586 to Bock *et al.* as stated on page 5 of the Office Action. For similar reasons as above, the combination of Kennedy and Bock does not render the present invention obvious. In particular, Kennedy lacks any suggestion of the range of viscosities for the first and second reactable components. And, because the Examiner appears to cite Bock only for its disclosure of the percent of isocyanate groups in a polyisocyanate, Bock does not cure the deficiencies of Kennedy.

In fact, Bock generally discloses a process for preparing polyisocyanates containing isocyanurate groups by partial trimerization of the isocyanate groups of isophorone diisocyanate. *See* Abstract. Bock does not, however, even suggest the use of its polyisocyanates with a second reactable component comprising at least one polyol, polyamine, or epoxy-containing compound to form a portion of golf equipment, as presently recited. As such, a skilled artisan would not have been motivated to look to Bock to remedy any of the discussed deficiencies of Kennedy absent the present invention to use as a template.

Based on the combination's lack of teaching or suggestion with regard to the subject matter in dependent claim 54, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based thereon.

Kennedy and Peter Do Not Render Obvious Claims 29 and 48-53

Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 29 and 48-53 under § 103(a) as obvious over Kennedy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,174,984 to Peter as provided on pages 5-6 of the Office Action.

Like the other two independent claims, independent claim 29 also recites the specific range of viscosity for the first and second reactable components. Thus, Kennedy also does not render the invention recited in independent claim 29 (and those claims depending therefrom) obvious because the reference is completely silent as to at least this feature of the invention.

Peter does not cure this deficiency. Like Kennedy, Peter is completely silent as to viscosity ranges of the first and second reactable components. As such, a skilled artisan would not have been motivated to arrive at the presently claimed invention based on two references that do not even suggest viscosity ranges of the first and second reactable components.

For the reasons above, the combination of Kennedy and Peter does not render obvious the present invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based thereon.

Claim 9 Is Not Rendered Obvious By Kennedy and Sullivan

Finally, claim 9 was rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Kennedy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,213,895 to Sullivan for the reasons stated on page 7 of the Office Action. As discussed above, Kennedy does not disclose the invention presently recited in independent claim 1. And, because Sullivan is cited merely for its disclosure of inner cover layer hardness, it does not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference with regard to the present invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of the Kennedy and Sullivan results in or renders obvious the present invention. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection based on the combination.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER

Applicants submit herewith a Request for Change in Attorney Docket Number from 20002.0024A to 20002.0350. Applicants request that the change be recorded and acknowledged.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 20002.0350.

Respectfully submitted,
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP

Dated: September 17, 2004

By: Stephanie D. Scruggs

Stephanie D. Scruggs, Registration No. 54,432
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7755 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile